525
G785
Copy 1

AT KIND OF A FIGHT ARE WE IN?

Ernest R. Groves

WHAT KIND OF A FIGHT ARE WE IN?

BY

ERNEST R. GROVES

Author of
"Rural Problems of Today," "Moral Sanitation," etc.

ASSOCIATION PRESS
NEW YORK: 347 MADISON AVENUE
1918

D525
.S785

Copyright, 1918, by
The International Committee of
Young Men's Christian Associations

JUL 20 1918

©CLA499810

DEDICATED TO

All Wearers of the Red Triangle, Whose Self-forgetting and Indispensable Service to the Soldiers and Sailors of the Allied Nations, Both in Home Lands and Overseas, Has Become for All Time a Priceless Example of Spiritual Devotion

CONTENTS

I. The Moral Significance of the War 1
II. The Conflict of Man Against Man 8
III. Darwinism and Race Conflict.. 14
IV. American Idealism..... 21
V. German Retardation..... 30
VI. Christianity and the War..... 35
VII. Religion and the Future..... 40

Chapter I

THE MORAL SIGNIFICANCE OF THE WAR

We are in the midst of what appears to be the supreme conflict in man's experience. With every passing day it becomes clearer that this German-begotten war is a peculiar and desperate attack upon the spiritual welfare of men and women everywhere. It is this fact which gives the present world struggle the significance of a moral plague. It is no contest for markets. Neither in race feeling nor religious antipathy can we find its roots. It is essentially a moral collision and one that forbids compromise.

Germany, with diabolical forethought and skilful preparation, has attempted to bring to a fruitful victory, by any means possible, a philosophy of life which the better part of human

experience has most certainly repudiated. It is this which makes the present ordeal, from which all peoples now suffer and for many years to come must continue to suffer, *colossal* in its moral consequences.

Such a happening cannot be the event of a day, a strange ethical accident without history or cause. The Germans also are of flesh and blood. Some false ideal must impel them. What deeply-planted and well-nourished impulse has caused them to break out upon the astonished nations as a people driven by the passion of a moral mutiny? The madness that has already changed an honored member of the family of nations into a moral outlaw must have a moral and spiritual explanation. It is of the greatest importance that we of America understand the moral causes of this conflict. It is not enough that we fight. We also must fight with moral discernment, lest in

the process of fighting we ourselves become Germanized. With our allies we have become the custodians of the moral security of nations and we cannot exaggerate the importance of knowing the issues of this struggle.

We are all familiar with the Darwinian controversy that made so bitter and so unfortunate a division among thinking people about a generation ago. The world of thought was separated by a great gulf. For the most part religious people were on one side and men of science on the other. The Church at the beginning fought against the evolutionary hypothesis and fought a losing fight. As we look back upon the controversy it seems as strange as it was unfortunate. As a matter of fact, this generation has not been perfectly fair to the religious leadership of fifty years ago. The Church had the right instinct in the controversy and perhaps its protest was more effective than is

generally considered. It failed merely in its form of attack. It had no fitness to engage in a debate of science. It did have, however, a solemn obligation to protest against science doing violence to the moral interpretation of human experience.

Science was equally at fault. In the spirit of a belligerent it tried to deduce from man's animal history an interpretation of human characteristics and motives that had already been outgrown by the fact of moral progress. And the protest of those who were guardians of human idealism was immediate and forceful. It also was unfortunately expressed, for the issues were not clearly defined. Science won the victory, so far as the maintaining of its hypothesis of evolution was concerned.

Science, however, had to modify its first teaching regarding Darwinism in order to do justice to the fact of man's social evolution. Indeed, Darwin him-

self in the very beginning seems to have been fearful that his theory would be used as a basis for a brutal and one-sided view of human nature. And among his students were some—Drummond and Kropotkin for example—who from the first felt that the higher life even of the animals had been distorted by the interpretation made in the name of evolution by some of Darwin's disciples. Drummond[1] insisted that mother-sacrifice, as well as struggle, had its place in animal development. Kropotkin[2] pointed out the importance of cooperation among animals in their struggle for existence. In recent years science has come to see in the clearest way how differently we need to interpret man's social evolution from the way in which it was first constructed by those who accepted the doctrine of evolution.

[1] Henry Drummond, "The Ascent of Man."
[2] Kropotkin, "Mutual Aid."

The immediate effect of the Darwinian theory was to stimulate that philosophy, always captivating to some, which pictures the association of men and women as a brutal struggle, different from animal competition only in its form. Man was portrayed as the supreme animal, merely more powerful and better equipped than the others.

Nowhere did this philosophy receive such hospitality as among the German-speaking peoples. When Darwinism, in the place of its birth, was first applied to man's social life, it appeared as an attack upon the religious faith of mankind, a denial of Christianity, but in the German thinking it came to be itself religious, the indispensable element in a proper understanding of the ways of God.

No German statement has ever made this clearer than the following:

"The old churchmen preached of war as a just judgment of God. The

modern natural scientists see in war a propitious method of selection. They use different phrases, but they mean the same thing. A saying of the much-misunderstood Jesus, himself supreme in the comprehension of life—a saying whose profound wisdom Darwin has again enabled us to grasp—is the concise expression of all development: 'Many are called, but few are chosen.' "[8]

[8] Wagner, "Krieg," pp. 145, 146. Quoted by Thayer in "Out of Their Own Mouths," pp. 75, 76.

Chapter II

THE CONFLICT OF MAN AGAINST MAN

Nietzsche has been one of the most popular of German writers. He applied the theory of competition to the group life of men and women. It is true that Nietzsche refused to admit that he was a follower of Darwin and in a most characteristic fashion he attempted to belittle the influence Darwin's theory had upon his thinking. As a matter of fact, however, in Nietzsche's teaching we find the idea of struggle and survival applied to the ordinary relations of life. In studying him we enter the familiar atmosphere of brutal conflict. His originality is in the form he gives his thought and in the frank way he teaches the doctrine that in human relationships the supreme virtue is power.

He denies the obligation of the strong to the weak, regards pity as a fault, and makes war a virtue. He was a gifted writer and it was natural that his fascinating application of Darwinian ethics to the ordinary affairs of life should among German peoples command attention and finally become popular. In every country he has had some following, for everywhere there are some who can see in the evolutionary process merely the element of survival through struggle and who regard successful competition as the supreme good in human association. In Germany, however, Nietzsche has been very popular and without doubt his teaching has had some part in making this terrible world war possible. His teaching is most significant as a revelation of the philosophy of struggle that has so captivated German thinking.

It was logical for Nietzsche to make a bitter attack upon Christianity, for it

had become the strongest protest against the supremacy of selfishness and force in human relationships. He saw in Christianity the enemy of his doctrine and his vision was clear. Religion may not go down with the enthronement of the philosophy of struggle, but Christianity must. Between two such different doctrines of morality there can be no compromise. The Golden Rule is an infinite distance from the ethics of the superman as pictured by Nietzsche.

The following quotations are representative of Nietzsche's attitude toward Christianity:

"I call Christianity the one great curse, the one great intrinsic depravity, the one great instinct of revenge, for which no expedient is sufficiently poisonous, secret, subterranean, mean—I call it the one immortal blemish of mankind."

"That which deifies me, that which makes me stand apart from the whole,

of the rest of humanity is the fact that I have unmasked Christian morality. . . . . Christian morality is the most malignant form of all falsehood, the actual Circe of humanity, that which has corrupted mankind."[1]

"Have I yet to say that in the whole New Testament only a single figure appears, which one is obliged to honor—Pilate, the Roman governor. To take a Jewish affair seriously, he will not be persuaded to do so. A Jew more or less —what does that matter? The noble scorn of a Roman before whom a shameless misuse of the word truth was carried on has enriched the New Testament with the sole expression which has value—which is itself its criticism, its annihilation. What is truth?"[2]

Nietzsche was as friendly toward war as he was hostile to Christianity. The following statements of his in regard to war and warriors have become familiar because their significance has caused them to be often quoted:

[1] "Ecce Homo," p. 354, p. 139.
[2] "Antichrist," p. 316.

"Ye shall love peace as a means to new wars, and the short peace better than the long.

I do not advise you to work, but to fight. I do not advise you to conclude peace, but to conquer. Let your work be a fight, your peace a victory!"

"Ye say a good cause will hallow even war. I say unto you: a good war halloweth every cause.

War and courage have done more great things than charity. Not your pity, but your bravery, hath hitherto saved those who had met with an accident."

"They call you heartless, but your heart is genuine, and I love the shame of your heartiness. Ye are ashamed of your tide, and others are ashamed of their ebb.

Ye are ugly. Well then, my brethren! Wrap the sublime round yourselves, the mantle of what is ugly!

And when your soul waxeth great, it waxeth haughty and in your sublimity there is wickedness. I know you."[2]

---

[2] "Thus Spake Zarathustra" (Tille tr.), p. 60.

The popularity of such teaching is proof that it contained an agreeable doctrine. It was a vigorous branch from the main trunk which supported German political thought and which drew its nourishment from roots imbedded in an archaic interpretation of evolution. Such teaching, therefore, added its contribution to the insidious mass that permeated the national thinking of Germany until the policy of a great empire became a moral menace to all nations.

Chapter III

DARWINISM AND RACE CONFLICT

Nietzsche applied the Darwinian conflict to individual life and denied the moral claims of pity, sympathy, and sacrifice. An Austrian scholar and scientist, Gumplowicz, one of the greatest of European sociologists, interpreted the relationship of nations in the same spirit and built up a theory of race conflict upon the Darwinian hypothesis. In the strongest terms he declared himself a pessimist in world-philosophy and made the chief cornerstone of his system the statement that the social life of men is unchanging, fixed by " 'eternal iron laws' as truly as the stars in their courses." Optimists in world philosophy who expect to improve human association for the welfare of men and women are never genu-

ine scientists. In other words, science reveals man's relationships as merely animal in spirit, even necessarily brutal, and only ignorance and foolish conceit give one hope of ever changing the unhappy but fixed social order of human experience.

Especially stupid are those kindly persons who look forward to a time when nations will deal kindly and justly with one another and in the spirit of good understanding live at peace. To indulge in the thoughts of such a benevolent program for the peoples of the earth as an event ever likely to happen even in the distant future is merely to set reason and experience aside, and, in disregard of the clearest revelations of science, to accept the intoxicating pleasures of social and political day-dreaming.

This doctrine is expressed in characteristic fashion in the following quotations from Gumplowicz:

"Nothing impresses thinking men so seriously as the contemplation of the social struggle, for its immorality offends their moral feelings deeply. Individuals can consider ethical requirements, they have consciences, but societies have none. They overfall their victims like avalanches with irresistible destroying power. All societies, large and small, retain the character of wild hordes in considering every means good which succeeds. Who would look for fidelity, veracity, and conscience in the intercourse of the 'most civilized' states of the world?"[1]

"However cordial the personal relations of the monarchs, not one will cease arming. It is felt instinctively that with the first favorable opportunity any state will pounce like a wild beast upon a defenseless victim. Indeed, it is generally recognized that states oppose each other like savage hordes; that they follow the blind laws of nature; that no ethical law or moral obligation, only the fear of the stronger, holds them in

[1] "The Outlines of Sociology" (Moore tr.), p. 146.

check; and that neither right nor law, treaty nor league, can restrain the stronger from seeking its own interests when the opportunity is offered.

The same is true of the struggle of the social groups in general. It is conducted not by individuals but by societies and communities."[2]

It is folly to criticize those who are forced to lead nations into these perfidious struggles, for they are personally blameless, since they are captives in a cosmic system that offers them no choice. There is no mistaking this position of Gumplowicz, which he states as follows:

"But these 'perfidious' struggles do not show the individuals to be utterly base. They only prove that in the struggle of the wholes individual opinions play no part, that here social groups struggle inexorably to satisfy their own interests, to demonstrate their own power. Blind natural law

[2] Ibid. p. 147.

controls the actions of savage hordes, of states, and of societies."[8]

The conquest of the weak nation by the strong is inevitable and the protest comes only from those who suffer what they would inflict were they in turn powerful enough to do so. This cruel interpretation of national survival Gumplowicz expresses in these words:

"So long as a compact and powerful body politic finds itself in the midst of weaker states it will continue its policy of conquest and annexation to the last possible limit, as Rome did in Italy and as Russia is doing in the East where its neighbors are weak and loosely-organized.

If all are equally powerful so that no one can hope to overthrow any other one, then two or more will form alliances in order to conquer the selected object of attack. If a weaker state happens to be neighbor to several more powerful, it must supplement its strength by alliances or they will not

[8] Ibid. p. 148.

fail to partition it among themselves. No code of private morals can successfully oppose; even the men who are individually the most exemplary are forced to act in harmony with their surroundings. The scruples of individual feeling and sentiment are unknown in politics; as Emperor Francis said: 'The state has no daughter.'

Political conditions are peremptory. Natural law prevails though the will of the individual seems to be 'free.' Those who suffer speak of 'crimes.' As well call an earthquake by which thousands have perished a crime, for the only difference is that in the one case we think we see the responsible agents while in the other we can find none."[4]

It is impossible to estimate the influence of this Austrian thinker upon the social ideals of the rulers and peoples of Germany and Austria, but in the light of the events that have forced this world-conflict upon suffering peoples and the unspeakable indifference to eth-

[4] Ibid. p. 151.

ical and humane obligations manifested by the leaders of the Central Powers, it certainly seems that, whether Gumplowicz influenced much or little Germanic political thought, he disclosed its philosophic basis. His system is at least a characteristic expression of the same brutal disregard of the moral demands of human relationship that has so shocked and prostrated the political idealism of the neutral world.

Chapter IV

AMERICAN IDEALISM

The national consciousness of Germany has been fattened for years upon false inferences from the Darwinian theory of evolution. The American finds difficulty in appreciating this, since his idealism has been drawn from so different a source. Morality among nations cannot be secured, however, until there is widespread confidence in the reasonableness of the American ideal. To establish this confidence it is first necessary to put emphasis upon the happier and more humane interpretations of the evolutionary process, as it is now best understood by science.

Recent science has made competition between animals a minor element in the struggle for survival and has disclosed as the fundamental element in the process the adjustment of the organism to

the demands of the environment. If this interpretation of animal evolution be used as a basis for the understanding of the social problems of men and women, the result is both happier and more just than that first made by Darwinian thought. This later construction gives an opportunity for the exercise of the higher moral qualities that man has regarded throughout historic time as most characteristic of him. Emphasis upon the competitive element, on the other hand, interprets man as belonging in the field of endless conflict, where the hand of every one is against his neighbor amid such conditions of life as make the idealism of the New Testament nothing more than a treacherous mirage.

The way of escape from this picture of cosmic immorality is through a healthier and more reasonable attitude regarding the significance of man's social life. The German people, the

German thinkers even, do not hold to their pessimistic portrayal of the limitations of human associations, except in the territory of national relationships. It is only in his national interests that man must remain a brute. Germans, like other people, have realized the value of cooperation among human beings and the necessity of charity and sympathy. Their uncomfortable theory of animal conflict has, however, made it next to impossible for them to discover that the scientific basis for their practical cooperation and benevolence in the ordinary walks of life is an equally reliable support for justice and friendliness among nations.

No American author has stated the German fallacy more clearly than did the famous scientist, Lester Ward. He was of the generation of Darwin and Huxley and in scientific preparation no one had a better right to take part in the discussion concerning the meaning of

organic evolution. His teaching, born of intimate knowledge in regard to the facts as reported by science, was diametrically the opposite of that which so gripped German popular thought.

No one has more forcefully stated this opposition than Gumplowicz, nor with greater respect. It was a dramatic meeting that took place between Gumplowicz and Ward at Graz in 1903, when, for the first time, Gumplowicz felt the force of an optimism built upon science. In most generous fashion Gumplowicz himself has stated this fact in the following tribute:[1]

"To confess the truth at once, before I was aware, he had stormed my principal pessimistic position, and as I took leave of him at the station late in the evening, after a half-day's debate, I had the feeling that I had made the acquaintance of an intellectual giant of a type that I had never before met in reality.

[1] An Austrian Appreciation of Lester F. Ward, *American Journal of Sociology,* March, 1905, p. 646

Since that time I am studying his works with quite other feelings from those with which I read them before. To be sure, no man can change his fundamental spiritual tone, nor can one easily get rid of a world-view which is a product of a long life. Perhaps one can never get rid of it. But I am free to confess that in place of the former feeling of confidence in my own views, perhaps of my own superiority to a 'utopian,' there had come a feeling of hesitation, still more a feeling of admiration for a *Menschheits-Idealismus,* of which we Europeans (with the exception of Franz Oppenheimer) are entirely incapable."

American idealism is nourished by confidence in man's ability to construct an international relationship that will be far removed from the brutal Darwinian struggle for existence. This confidence is the daily bread that feeds our national thinking. No author has given us a greater sense of security with reference to social and international op-

timism than Ward. As early as 1888 he stated in clear form in the following words the basis of the American assurance:[2]

"But how shall we distinguish this human, or anthropic, method from the method of nature? Simply by reversing all the definitions. Art is the antithesis of nature. If we call one the natural method we must call the other the artificial method. If nature's process is rightly named natural selection, man's process is artificial selection. The survival of the fittest is simply the survival of the strong, which implies, and might as well be called, the destruction of the weak. And if nature progresses through the destruction of the weak, man progresses through the *protection* of the weak. This is the essential distinction.

In human society the psychic power has operated to secure the protection of the weak in two distinct ways: first, by increasing the supply of the necessi-

[2] Mind as a Social Factor, "Glimpses of the Cosmos," Vol. III, p. 371.

ties of life, and, secondly, by preventing the destruction of life through the enemies of man. The immediate instrumentality through which the first of these processes is carried on is art, the product of invention. The second process takes place through the establishment of positive institutions."

"Art operates to protect the weak against adverse surroundings. It is directed against natural forces, chiefly physical. By thus defeating the destructive influences of the elements and hostile forms of life, and by forcing nature to yield an unnatural supply of man's necessities, many who would have succumbed from inability to resist these adverse agencies—the feebler members of society—were able to survive, and population increased and expanded. While no one openly denies this, there is a tendency either to ignore it in politico-economic discussions, or to deny its application to them as an answer to naturalistic arguments.

If, on the other hand, we inquire into the nature of human institutions, we shall perceive that they are of three

kinds, tending to protect the weak in three ways, or ascending degrees. These three successively higher means through which this end is attained are, first, Justice, second, Morality, and third, Charity. These forms of action have been reached through the development, respectively, of the three corresponding sentiments: Equity, Beneficence, and Benevolence.

All of these altruistic sentiments are wholly unknown, or known only in the merest embryo, to all animals below man, and therefore no such means of protection exist among them. They are strictly human, or anthropic. Many evolutionists fail to recognize this. Some sociologists refuse to admit it. They look about and see so much injustice, immorality, and rapacity that they are led to suppose that only natural methods are in operation in society. This is a great mistake. In point of fact, the keener the sense of justice the more conspicuous the diminishing number of violations of it come to appear, and conversely, the obviousness of injustice proves the general prevalence

of justice. It is the same with morality and philanthropy."[3]

In speaking of the future supremacy of the psychic method of evolution, Ward says:

"These ends will be secured in proportion as the true nature of mind is understood. When nature comes to be regarded as passive and man as active, instead of the reverse as now, when human action is recognized as the most important of all forms of action, and when the power of the human intellect over vital, psychic, and social phenomena is practically conceded, then, and then only, can man justly claim to have risen out of the animal and fully to have entered the human stage of development."[4]

[3] Ibid. p. 372.
[4] Ibid. p. 377.

Chapter V

GERMAN RETARDATION

Why has German nationalism clung so tenaciously to the theory of brutal survival? This question comes to the mind of every reader, but at the present time it cannot receive a satisfactory answer. Without doubt it will remain a puzzle for historians, psychologists, and students of public affairs for many years to come—perhaps for centuries. In matters of international relationship German leaders have done their thinking on the level of a survival philosophy which the representative thought of the other modern nations has discarded. It appears as if the final indictment against German leadership would be that it is guilty of moral retardation. Of course this situation must have some explanation. Already

it is possible to discern some of the causes that have led this powerful nation, progressive in its use of the resources of modern life, to linger behind its neighbors in international idealism.

There is some evidence that the Prussian people represent the most belligerent group of the great fighting race, the Teutons. The French, English, and German nationalities include the same fundamental racial stocks, but the Germanic peoples appear closer to the primitive racial type, at least in their traditions, and indeed some of their writers are boastful of this fact. As, for example, "The Teutonic race is called to circle the earth with its rule, to exploit the treasures of nature and of human labor power, and to make the passive races servient elements in its cultural development."[1] Close contact with less advanced races tends to devel-

[1] Ludwig Woltmann, "Politische Anthropologie." Quoted in "Out of Their Own Mouths," p. 70.

op in the superior race a strong race consciousness and it may well be that the German peoples emphasize their Teutonic characteristics because of their close association with the Slavic population of Russia.

The recent historical experiences of the German peoples explain in part the retrogressive spirit of their nationalism. Napoleon, by cruelly crushing them, made them feel deeply the defencelessness of a country politically divided and lacking in military preparedness. In the days of Bismarck they came into political unity by a most successful war against France, which was manufactured by him through an act of treachery for the purpose of Prussianizing the empire. Social Darwinism, as a philosophy of national welfare, seemed proven by the sufferings of the country under Napoleon; the same theory of the necessity of brutal struggle between nations saved their national conscience

from accepting criticism for their ill-treatment of France.

There appears to be proof also that great commercial interests, such as Krupps, which profit by war and preparations for war, have used money to popularize the doctrine of race conflict.[2]

Without question, however, the chief cause of Germany's political retardation, so far as present knowledge can reveal such causes, is to be found in the teaching of her schools and universities. These have been controlled by the state and this has permitted them to become the instrument for advancing the ambition of the Prussian autocracy. Of course, if nations are without moral obligations and exist in an environment of perpetual conflict, the wise nation will maintain the political organization best fitted to protect a nation under such

---

[2] Todd, "Theories of Social Progress," p. 275.

circumstances. Without doubt, to people thinking in the atmosphere of social Darwinism there could be no escape from the conclusion that the best political organization for military strength was an autocracy. To be sure, not all German thinking has accepted this proposition. Indeed, it may be sometime proved that the occasion of this bitter European struggle was the realization of the autocratic leaders that there was a growing opposition to the accepted theory, led by those who had been educated in the world of class-experience rather than in the universities. In that case it will be revealed that the only object of the war was to establish with greater security the rule of the Prussian autocracy.

Chapter VI

CHRISTIANITY AND THE WAR

We have long since traveled beyond the question, "Can Christians fight?" As Christians we must fight against this desperate attack upon the foundations of the moral security of nations and peoples. We are now asking a new question, "What effect will the war have upon religion?"

It is folly to suppose that we can pass through so horrible an ordeal as this present war, an experience that has already made profound changes in many departments of life, without feeling some influence from it in our religion.

It has been difficult for the non-German peoples to realize the inability of religion to protect civilization from what this war has brought forth. We still suffer as from a moral shock, for we had taken it for granted that Chris-

tianity had too firm a hold of the motives of all peoples professing it to permit the events that are already recorded. It is to be expected, therefore, that many will, at least for the time, doubt the moral vitality of Christianity. We can by no means escape from the difficulty by saying that Christianity has not failed because it has not been tried. The problem is, Why has it not been tried? Is its program a mere religious day-dreaming experience, an emotional refuge that can protect us from life but cannot protect us in life? We must expect such questions to be asked. Indeed, who has not asked them in his own deepest thoughtfulness?

It would be unwise for us not to realize the significance of such questions. In times past they would not have been asked at all, for they would have had no force. In earlier periods in man's history everything that has

happened in this war would have been taken for granted as bound to occur if within the ingenuity of man. Our moral shock is proof positive of our moral progress. Indeed we have substantial proof that Christianity can control the natural passions of men in even so great a moral catastrophe as this from which we suffer. Every time an English boat rescues the survivors from a sinking German submarine, tribute is paid to the dominance that Christian principles still exercise over the hearts of sorely-tempted men.

Indeed, it looks as if Christianity had all but saved the world from so terrible a conflict and that our consciousness of this is the root of our bitter disappointment. The failure is none the less real because it was so nearly prevented. Where has been the difficulty?

Has it not been in the desire of men and women to place the emphasis in religion upon something else than ac-

tivity? We have had too much of the brutal survival-conception in our ordinary associations of life to feel the necessity of discarding the theory in our international relations. We have taken kindly to other definitions of Christian faith than that which insists that faith is such confidence in God's moral absoluteness as leads men and women into right relations with one another. This conception of faith is a morally expensive program, since it demands action—at least the desire for action—and many there are who prefer an easier program.

Christianity will need to make greater demands upon the doings of men and women from now on, or it cannot maintain its position as the supreme moral influence in life. As Christianity leads men and women away from animal, away from primitive, away from pagan levels of conduct to higher and higher forms of human association,

it has to increase its demands at each step of progress. It cannot with moral safety permit its followers to linger even on high levels, when the revelation of human needs discloses new heights that can be attained.

The great nations of the earth are in desperate need of a new disclosure of compelling Christian idealism. In each social wrongs have been too long endured. Ethical conventions and social attitudes have been outgrown and no longer fit the needs created by modern habits of life. The moral level of yesterday is no longer safe. The war points out to Christianity its present task. It must provide motive power to draw both nations and individuals above the moral level of Darwinian conduct.

Chapter VII

RELIGION AND THE FUTURE

Will Prussianism reach its goal?

At this moment when the armies are in deadly and uncertain grip on the Western front no man knows. It is true that the God of battles often seems to be on the side of the heavier artillery. Nevertheless it is difficult to imagine a German victory.

As a spiritual conquest the German program is, however, impossible. Man does not go backward, even if he moves forward with painful slowness. Man will not return to the atmosphere of animal struggle from which he has so largely escaped.

Only the moral atheist, who believes in the morality neither of God nor of man, can have misgivings at this point. Against the dominance for any length

of time of the cruel, survival code for national and individual conduct, even were the Krupp guns to bring a German peace, there remain two insurmountable obstacles.

In the first line of defence stands man. Stripped of all pretense, familiar with both evil and good, with the shadow of his primitive past thrown upon him to hamper his vision, nevertheless he stands firm against a portrayal of his nature that forbids his moral growth. For a moment he may forget his spiritual promise under the stress of national passion produced by clever, reprehensible ambition, but not for long. Led by deceit to support the malicious program in the delusion that he fights merely for national self-protection, sooner or later he will see clearly his moral betrayal. In that day, with all the moral vigor that he has gathered from his first day until now, he will turn upon his moral seducers

and execute the judgment of spiritual repudiation.

Behind man stands God. Not the pagan God of man's childhood whom we are glad to forget, but the God of Christ who has given surety of His confidence in man's moral worth. We would not infringe His purposes, for well we know that His ways are not our ways nor His thoughts our thoughts, but in a contest between man at a low level and man at his highest we can hardly believe in God at all and suppose that the final issues of such a spiritual struggle are in doubt. It is stupid skepticism that trembles, fearful of the moral destiny of the universe of God.

Deacidified using the Bookkeeper process.
Neutralizing agent: Magnesium Oxide
Treatment Date: SEP 2012
PreservationTechnologies
A WORLD LEADER IN PAPER PRESERVATION
111 Thomson Park Drive
Cranberry Township, PA 16066
(724) 779-2111

LIBRARY OF CONGRESS
0 021 547 805 1